

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

1. Claims 2-9, 13-20, 24-31 and 35-43 are allowed.
2. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The primary reason for the allowance of claims 2-9, 13-20, 24-31 and 35-38 is because Neither Torkkola, Eriksson nor Casey teach a method for dynamic blind signal separation that includes producing orthogonality initialized signals by using results obtained in connection with a respective leading window to initialize orthogonality of signals associated with a following window and updating orthogonality of initially orthogonalised signals using following window data to produce updated orthogonalised signals. Applicants arguments on page 14 of the response submitted 2 September 2008, which stated that Eriksson does not disclose an explicit processing step or steps of using a leading window results to initialize orthogonality of signals associated with the following window, were persuasive.

The primary reason for the allowance of claims 38, 40 and 42 is because the prior art of record does not teach a method for dynamic blind signal separation including processing signals associated with pairs of windows of data that includes an acquisition stage of processing a first leading window of data to obtain first results that include a mean vector of signal samples, a covariance matrix of a data matrix of the first leading window and a fourth order tensor obtained from a moment of signal vectors derived by decorrelation and normalization of the data matrix.

The primary reason for the allowance of claims 29, 41 and 43 is because the prior art of record does not teach a method for dynamic blind signal separation that includes an acquisition stage and a subsequent stage of processing that includes iteratively updating preceding results using subsequent data snapshots to produce snapshot results that include a mean snapshot vector and a snapshot covariance matrix, a decorrelated and normalized snapshot equivalent providing signals from which to obtain their moment as a fourth order tensor update, the immediately preceding results being those obtained in a respective immediately preceding update if any and being the first results otherwise.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MANUEL L. BARBEE whose telephone number is (571)272-2212. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eliseo Ramos-Feliciano can be reached on 571-272-7925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Manuel L. Barbee/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2857

mlb  
December 9, 2008